9/17/75

Dear Harold,

Jerry called me last night to tell me about an article that Cory Ser Vass asked him to do for Sat. Even. Post, and asked me either to do it myself or to collaborate with him on it. The way he described it was that she was quite interested in pursuing the subject in the Post and wanted a piece "discussing the different views of the medical evidence." Jerry wasn't exactly sure what that meant, but he had in mind an article pointing out some of the major discrepancies, etc.

I told him that I would be interested in doing the article but only on certain conditions. I said first of all the article would have to identify and give proper credit to POST MORTEM, and let readers know how to get copies. Second, the article could not be done under the phony pretext of what different people think about the evidence, but rather have the focus of showing that a new investigation is necessary because of the state of the record re the medical evidence, the WC's failure to investigate and its falsifications, and how everybody since has either demolished the Report or been inept or dishonest themselves--e.g. Wecht & Lattimer.

I favor the piece for several reasons. My main motivation is that it would come out coincident with or shortly after PM is out and would be great promotion for it. Also, at this point I think a well done, responsible piece could help more than hurt, especially when we have such shit coming out from Newcomb and Wecht. And finally, I'm afraid of what the result would be if Jerry did it himself or, worse, if Ser Vass does what Jerry told me O'Toole talked her out of--have Wecht do the piece.

Jerry also told me that he had talked to Jim about this, who had talked to you and reported your unfavorable reaction. I'm not sure just what went out over the grapevine, but perhaps you got the wrong idea about the article. If this were 1972 again, I would disapprove any such article. But in the context of the time, I'm in favor of it, especially because I think it could be great publicity for PM.

If we do the piece, they want it within a few weeks. So please write me right away on your thoughts and feelings. If you are opposed, please be specific in telling me why. I have thought about it, and do not see it analogous to what Paul wanted to do with the 1/27 transcript. Also, I don't know what they pay, but whatever, I would insist on splitting it with you.

Write soon!

Best,

Harold